

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment and the following remarks are intended to fully respond to the Final Office Action mailed February 21, 2006. In that Office Action, claims 1-13 were examined, and all claims were rejected. More specifically, claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (USPN 6,732,362), hereinafter “Lee,” in view of Petty et al. (USPN 6,342,907), hereinafter “Petty.” Reconsideration of these rejections, as they might apply to the Original and amended claims in view of these remarks, is respectfully requested.

In this Response, claims 1 and 11 have been amended; no claims have been canceled or added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Petty. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), three basic criteria must be met, namely: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to combine the references or modify the reference teaching; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the reference or references when combined must teach or suggest each claim limitation. MPEP § 2142. Applicants respectfully assert that the amended claims preclude a finding of a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the references fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of the pending claims. In particular, the cited references do not teach or describe appending property pages for new resources to a property sheet.

The present invention as defined in the claims provides a method for managing multiple hardware and software resources in a networked environment.

This invention relates to a management system for managing computer-related resources within a distributed or network relationship. The management system

or “portal”, also uses web technology, preferably XML-technology, to reduce the overhead associated with existing management tools that depend heavily on a two-tier system having client computer systems connected to the computer resources themselves – which are inherently non-uniform in nature and make administration of computer systems difficult. In an embodiment of the invention, the management tool is a scalable, web-based management framework that manages a plurality of back-end resources in a uniform manner. The resources communicate with the management system via a conforming dialog, which is schema driven. Using these communications, the management system uniformly associates information from the various resources via various multi-step, scenario-based functions, such as, for example, searches, monitoring, scripting, software deployment, etc. That is, the management system is able to provide easier, higher-level operation options to the administrator based on the associated information related to the various resources.

Application, pages 4-5.

Lee provides “an object oriented exchange managing system and a method for installing an exchange resource.” Lee, col. 1, lines 51-53. More particularly, Lee provides a system and method for generating an object instance having certain, set attributes from known classes that provide a resource from an exchange service. *See generally*, Lee, col. 3, lines 5-60. Lee differs from the present invention in many important ways. While there are other reasons for allowability, Applicants wish to focus on a single issue. However, Applicants reserve the right to file continuation applications with claims directed to the other reasons for allowability.

The present invention, as defined in the claims, and Lee simply function differently. The present invention, as defined in the claims, creates a property sheet if necessary. *See application*, page 33, line 19 – page 34, line 2 (“Upon receiving the property page, a determine operation 604 determines whether the parent object, i.e., property sheet for that property page has already been defined by another resource.”). Then a property page, related to a resource and conforming to property page definition, is received. *See application*, page 33, lines 17-18 (“... receive operation relates to the property sheet manager 332 receiving a property page...”). The property page is appended to the created property sheet. *See application*, page 34, lines 4-6 (“The append

operation 606 appends the received property page to the property sheet. Essentially, the property sheet definition is modified, such as by the property page manager to include a pointer to the new property page.”) Each property sheet relates to an object, such as a user object, i.e., there can be several property sheets because there will be a property sheet for every object that uses the resource and a corresponding property page relating to the resource. *See application, page 28, lines 15-19 (“With respect to certain aspects of the present invention, the property sheets that are exposed to the system 304 by one resource are extendible by other resources. Fig. 5 illustrates the concept of having a separate, independent application or resource extend an existing property sheet. In Fig. 5, a property sheet representing a particular user object is illustrated in display 500.”).*

Lee is different because Lee discloses a set of classes for the resources. *See Lee, col. 3, lines 14-17 (“... the managing system 100 analyzes the received message using the SFP 108 to determine whether there is a base class corresponding the requested resources model in step 202.”) (emphasis added). Lee then checks if the available classes support the new resource. *See Lee, col. 3, lines 17-21 (“To this end, the SFP 108 determines whether the requested resource is available or whether the exchange (104/105) is capable of providing the service corresponding to the requested resource (i.e., whether the exchange is equipped to provide the smart card system.”). Lee does not create new classes if the current classes do not support the new resource. *See Lee, col. 3, lines 24-27 (“In the absence of such base class, the managing system 100 transmits an error message indicating a wrong resource installation request back to the operator through the GUI 102 in step 204.”). If the class does support the new resource, an attribute is determined and an object instance, with the changed attribute, is created for the new resource. The new resource is added to the ODBMS.* Lee states:**

On the other hand, in the presence of the base class in step 202, the managing system 100 determines the scope of a class to be processed by the SFP 108 in step 206, and determines whether the attribute values of the class satisfy the operator-requested condition through the FFP 110 in step 208. That is, the FFP 110, in step 208, determines one of the attribute[s] corresponding to the determined class, as each class has a set of attributes which defines different properties of the class. In step 210, REP 112 generates an object instance to access and update the ODBMS and also sends the object instance to the exchange.

Lee, col. 3, lines 28-38 (emphasis added).

Lee is different because Lee does not receive new property pages for new resources and append those new property pages to existing property sheets. Rather, Lee generates new objects from existing classes and adds the new objects to the ODBMS. For at least this reason, Lee does not disclose elements of the claimed invention as argued by the Examiner.

Petty does not overcome the inadequacies of Lee. Petty discloses a specification language to define user interface panels. *See* Petty, abstract and col. 3, lines 22-25. The specification language is a Panel Definition Markup Language (PDML) that allows a user to specify the exact location of components displayed in the panel. *See* Petty, abstract and col. 3, lines 25-30. In addition, Petty discloses a graphical editor that allows the creation and modification of platform-independent user interface panels; a conversion tool that can convert platform-specific user interface panels to corresponding platform-independent user interface panels; and a help generator tool that facilitates the generation of context-sensitive help for a user interface panel. *See* Petty, abstract and col. 3, lines 30-37.

Petty does not disclose, anywhere in the patent, a property sheet, property page, property sheet definition, or a property page definition. Like Lee, Petty describes object-oriented systems but does not describe documents or DTDs. *See* Petty, col. 4, line 31—col. 5, line 15. More importantly, Petty also does not disclose appending property pages to a property sheet when

adding new resources to a system. Thus, neither Lee nor Petty, either alone or in combination, discloses the present invention as defined in the claims.

For at least the reasons given above, amended claim 1 and amended claim 11 are allowable over Lee and Petty either alone or in combination. All other claims, i.e., claims 2-10 and 12-13 depend from allowable claims 1 and 11 and are also allowable over Lee and Petty either alone or in combination. As such, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner allow the claims and issue a Notice of Allowance at his earliest convenience.

Conclusion

This Amendment fully responds to the Final Office Action mailed February 21, 2006. Still, that Office Action may contain arguments and rejections and that are not directly addressed by this Amendment due to the fact that they are rendered moot in light of the preceding arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicants believe the argument has merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

In light of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Tadd F. Wilson, Reg. # 54,544
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
303.357.1651

Dated: 4/21/06

